

0156

Incoming OK  
00070013  
Task 2421

**From:** <everettarch@aol.com>  
**To:** <jerriannernstsen@utah.gov>  
**Date:** 7/28/2006 7:29:02 PM  
**Subject:** Lilla Cultural

Jerriann-

I wrote a little informal solution to the problem and dropped it off at Matt's office (attached). I also made up maps for him. He said he would look at it next week - he's pretty busy.

I don't need the other topo maps right now. Depending on what SHPO and DOGM needs, we will probably use them later.

I will be taking off for New York on Sunday, but will have my laptop and can be reached on my cell phone (602) 758-9335. On 7th through the 16th I will be in Europe. No phone service, but I will be checking my email.

Everett

---

Check out AOL.com today. Breaking news, video search, pictures, email and IM. All on demand. Always Free.

Matt-

Here are my thoughts on how to resolve this issue.

I had originally characterized three levels of site potential across the project area. Areas of higher site potential included those that are relatively level, are near water sources, and are on alluvial terraces associated with major drainages. It should be noted that in this region, even this does not rise to the level of high potential, just higher than the other two categories. Areas of low potential were areas of severe topography. Other areas, typically those of moderately topography away from water were assigned a moderate archaeological sensitivity. This last category also includes bluff edges, passes and high-level plateaus.

I did not consider rock shelters, granaries and rock art panels in this regime, since these, being on near vertical surfaces, are difficult to survey for. I had recommended that they be searched for using binoculars on the ground or from a helicopter. I suspect that these site types would have been observed by Montgomery during their initial survey effort.

I also considered the potential for subsidence. Areas with an estimated subsidence of greater than eight feet were considered high, less than five feet were considered low, and areas between five and eight feet were considered moderate. Portions of the project area where no subsidence would occur (mainly in the center and around the edges) were excluded from the survey area. I then created a simplified matrix of these two factors: areas with high site potential and high or moderate subsistence level would be 100% surveyed. The remaining areas would be 20% surveyed. The total surveyed area was somewhat less than that conducted by Montgomery.

Montgomery's sampling strategy made the assumption that only rock shelters, a relatively uncommon resource type, were likely to be affected by subsidence activities. Even if this were true, it is an argument that would be difficult to defend legally. Their sampling

regime did not distinguish between high and low potential for other site types (especially the more common prehistoric artifact scatter) or consider difference in anticipated subsistence.

Montgomery's sampling regime adequately sampled the areas that I had identified as having low and moderate site potentials; they did not adequately sample the areas I had recommended as having high potential.

My recommendations for supplementary survey are as follows:

1. Walk a transect on each side of Little Park Wash and on the eastern tributary of Little Park Wash that is located in the S1/2 of the S1/2 of Section 3. These transects should be sited on the level terrace area adjacent to the wash, but outside of areas of dense vegetation. This is a non-systematic survey designed to examine a particular landform only. A GPS unit set on stutler would assist in mapping this survey effort. Total distance: approximately 7.2 x 2 miles.
2. Survey three additional 20-acre plots strategically (not randomly) placed to cover areas of higher sensitivity not covered by the original survey. Total survey area: 60 acres.

This is sort of an after-the fact, bastardized stratified sample. I suspect this amount of additional work could be completed by two archaeologists in three days.

This approach is just one example of how DOGM might be satisfied. Another approach, one put forward by Montgomery for SHPO and DOM review, would be welcome.

Everetta